COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF *LEPUS DOUGLASII* GRAY, 1837, AS A *NOMEN OBLITUM*. Z.N.(S.) 1696

(see volume 22, pages 190–191)

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

I read Mr. Long's application with interest, but actually there is no need (yet) for an action by the Commission here.

Of the two competing names

Lepus douglasii Gray, 1837, *Mag. nat. Hist.* (n. ser.) **1** : 586 and

Lepus aquaticus Bachman, 1837, *Journ. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 7 (2) : 194

according to the Rules the latter has priority so that there is no need for suppressing the former.

Gray's paper was read in November, 1837, its actual date of publication is unknown, so that this has to be accepted as being 31 December, 1837, or if one takes the indication November on the fascicle as the date of publication, then it is 30 November, 1837.

According to p. viii of " An Index to the scientific contents of the journal and Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, 1812–1912 " published by the Academy in 1912, the second part of vol. 7 of the Journal of the Academy was presented to the Academy meeting of 21 November, 1837, and thus was published before that date. The date of publication of *Lepus aquaticus* for purposes of nomenclature is thus 21 November, 1837, and the name therefore has priority over *L. douglasii.*

In view of the fact that dates of publication of the two names are so close, and that new evidence may be forthcoming showing *L. douglasii* to be published earlier than *L. aquaticus*, I will not object to the suppression of the former name.